

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

John Gilmore Sampson, M.D., *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No. 13-10113

Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan, a
Michigan non-profit corporation, *et al.*,

Honorable Sean F. Cox

Defendants.

**ORDER DECLINING TO EXERCISE SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION
OVER STATE-LAW CLAIMS**

Plaintiffs filed this action against multiple Defendants, asserting federal question jurisdiction. Although this Court has federal question jurisdiction over Counts I through VII, the remaining counts are based upon state law. Plaintiffs ask the Court to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over those state-law claims.

The applicable statute regarding supplemental jurisdiction, 28 U.S.C. § 1367, provides, in pertinent part, that district courts may decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over a claim when:

- 1) the claim raises a novel or complex issue of State law;
- 2) the claim substantially predominates over the claim or claims over which the district court has original jurisdiction;
- 3) the district court has dismissed all claims over which it has original jurisdiction, or
- 4) in exceptional circumstances, there are other compelling reasons for declining jurisdiction.

28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).

Having reviewed the state law claims in Plaintiffs' complaint, this Court concludes that

Plaintiffs' state-law claims predominate. 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(2). In addition, the Court finds that the potential for jury confusion in this case would be great if Plaintiffs' federal claims were presented to a jury along with Plaintiffs' state-law claims. Thus, the potential for jury confusion is yet another reasons for this Court to decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' state-law claims. *United Mine Workers v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715 (1966); *Padilla v. City of Saginaw*, 867 F.Supp. 1309 (E.D. Mich. 1994); 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(4).

Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that this Court **DECLINES TO EXERCISE SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION OVER PLAINTIFFS' STATE-LAW CLAIMS** and Counts VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, and XVII of Plaintiffs' Complaint are hereby **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/Sean F. Cox

Sean F. Cox

United States District Judge

Dated: January 22, 2013

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record on January 22, 2013, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/Jennifer McCoy

Case Manager